



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/682,134	10/09/2003	David Arnold Luick	ROC920020127US1	1346

46296 7590 08/09/2006  
MARTIN & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
P.O. BOX 548  
CARTHAGE, MO 64836-0548

EXAMINER
----------

MEONSKE, TONIA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2181

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/682,134	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LUICK, DAVID ARNOLD	
	<b>Examiner</b> Tonia L. Meonske	<b>Art Unit</b> 2181	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tonia L. Meonske. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Bret J. Petersen. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 25 July 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: Terzian, US Patent 4,831,623.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 7/25/06  
 Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

#### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

An agenda for the meeting was submitted by Applicant in advance (see attached two pages).

In response to the first conclusion of Terzian as applied to claim 1 (see attached, page 2, lines 6-10), Examiner clarified that the first latch is not a multiplexer. The first latch is OP REG 0 and OP REG 1. The data output of the first latch is TEST MUX 0 and TEST MUX 1. The second latch is TEST REG 0 and TEST REG 1. The data input of the second latch is TRI0 and TRI1. The data input of the second latch is not accessible except through the data output of the first latch.

In response to the second conclusion of Terzian as applied to claim 9 (see attached, page 2, lines 11-16), Examiner clarified that the primary latch is OP REG 0 and OP REG 1. The secondary latches are TEST REG 0 and TEST REG 1. Examiner further clarified that the claims only require one data output from the plurality of secondary latches to be selected, in order for Terzian to read on the claims. When B0 is selected by OP MUX 0, Terzian has taught a data selection mechanism for selecting one data output from the plurality of secondary latches to feed back to the data input of the first latch, i.e. when any of the data outputs of the secondary latches is selected by either OP MUX 0 or OP MUX 1, then Terzian reads on the claims.

Examiner noted that Applicant's disclosed invention is different than the invention of Terzian, but the claims are not limiting enough to overcome Terzian. Examiner proposed that the Applicant amend the claims to include language similar to "a data selection mechanism for selecting one data output only from among each of the data outputs from the plurality of secondary latches." Examiner indicated that this language appears to overcome Terzian.

ATTACHMENT PAGE 1/2  
TO  
INTERVIEW  
SUMMARY  
7/25/06

To: Tonia Meonske

From: Bret Petersen 417-358-5757

7/18/06 11:29:38 Page 1 of 2

## FACSIMILE COVER PAGE

Date: 7/18/06  
Time: 11:29:36  
Page: 1

To: Tonia Meonske  
Fax #: 571-273-4170

From: Bret Petersen  
Title: Patent Attorney  
Company: Martin & Associates, L.L.C.  
Address: P.O. Box 548  
Carthage, MO 64836-0548  
USA

Fax #: 417-358-5757  
Voice #: 417-358-4700

Message:

Attention: Examiner Tonia Meonske

Agenda for Examiner Interview

ATTACHMENT  
TO  
INTERVIEW  
SUMMARY  
7/25/06

PAGE 2/2

Agenda for Examiner Interview

Application 10/682,134

I would like to discuss the Examiner's interpretation of the Terizan reference and how it reads on claim 1. Specifically, I am looking for answers to the following questions about the Examiner's rejection.

A first conclusion of the response to arguments is:

"So the second latch (Test Reg0 and Test Reg 1) is not accessible except through the data output of the first latch (Test Mux 0 and Test Mux 1)."

This seems to suggest that the first latch is a multiplexor. Is this the Examiner's interpretation?

A second conclusion of the response to arguments is:

"The output from Test Reg0 is from the plurality of secondary latches (The secondary latches are Test Reg 0 and Test Reg 1)."

This seems to suggest that Test Reg 0 and Test Reg 1 are the secondary latches. What is the primary latch? The text seems to suggest that Test Reg 0 is the primary latch. Is Test Reg 0 the primary latch and a secondary latch?